

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed October 25, 2007.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-13, 15-19, 22-26, 28-31, 33, 36-40, 42-45, 47, 50-54, 56-60, 63-67 and 69-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robertson et al. (U.S. 5,295,243).

Claims 3, 6, 7, 14, 20, 21, 27, 32, 34, 35, 41, 46, 48, 49, 55, 61, 62, and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Patent 6,327,628).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature that the class is an object oriented programming language class. This distinguishes the class from element 180 of Robertson. Claim 1, as amended, is not shown or made obvious, by the cited prior art.

Claims 17, 30, 44 and 58 have been amended to include the feature that “the interchangeable life cycle component runs on at least one processor”. This feature distinguishes the “interchangeable lifecycle driver” of the claims from the processor of Robertson. Claims 17, 30, 44 and 58, as amended, are not shown or made obvious by the cited prior art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 15, 2007

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

By: /Joseph P. O'Malley/
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226